

REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18 and 20-25 are pending and under consideration.

In the Final Office Action mailed February 2, 2007, claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18 and 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Martin. The foregoing rejections of the pending claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18, and 20-25 are respectfully traversed.

Each of the independent claims 2, 8, 14, and 20 have been amended to recite "creating the response data corresponding to the request data in accordance with the control information by preventing an area restricted from being provided" as in line 5-6 of claim 2, for example. Page 3 of the Office Action cited column 9, lines 27-37 and FIG. 11, step D in Martin as anticipating this feature of the claims. In Fig. 11, Step D refers to ignoring geometric object O and in column 9, line 37-38, O is retransmitted at step G. Furthermore, Martin states "re-render on the server the part of I that is occluded by O. Let this area be background image B" at column 9, lines 33-35. Providing depth to I and creating background image B is described by Martin as "the n bits stored at each pixel address in a Z-buffer 110e represent the depth of the object visible at that pixel" in column 6, lines 45-47. Thus, Martin uses a Z-buffer in Step D of Fig. 11 to "ignor[e] O" and "re-render on the server... [image] I" (column 9, lines 33-35). This in contrary to "preventing an area restricted from being provided" as recited above, however, because O is eventually transmitted (in step G) and using a Z-buffer does not "prevent... an area from being provided".

Dependent claims 3, 9 and 15 each recite "wherein the control information contains information for identifying said request source, and designating information for designating a data area restricted from being provided" at lines 2 and 3 in claim 3, for example. The Office Action cited a portion of Martin that simply describes how a graphics subsystem works and does discuss control information, let alone the features of control information recited in these independent claims.

Therefore, in view of the above, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18, and 20-25 is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 4, 2007

By: /David E. Moore/
David E. Moore
Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501